

REMARKS

Applicant adds new claims 11-20; therefore, claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Palatsi, and claims 3-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (Anderson).

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representatives during a person interview conducted on May 25, 2004.

The following comments constitute a Summary of Substance of the Interview, and a reply to the Examiner's rejections.

During the interview, Applicant's representatives presented arguments in support of the position set forth in Applicant's Response filed December 22, 2003. In particular, Applicant's representatives and the Examiner further reviewed Palatsi and Anderson references to ascertain whether these references illustrate items selected by a user (or operation items) displayed hierarchically and at the same time.

After further discussion, and review of other prior art references of record, the Examiner agreed that none of the prior art references of record discloses or suggests a portable apparatus where at least one operation item previously selected by a user is displayed hierarchically with at least one operation item currently selectable by the user.

Applicant amends independent claims 1 and 3 explicitly to recite the feature of at least one operation item previously selected by the user being displayed hierarchically with at least one operation item currently selectable by the user. Applicant respectfully submits that, as

agreed during the interview, this amendment is merely a clarifying amendment, and therefore, no estoppel is created. As further noted during the interview, Applicant adds new claims 11-20 which parallel claims 1-10, but avoid the "means-plus-function" terminology.

Since the prior art of record does not disclose, or suggest, the unique combinations of features as recited in Applicant's claims 1-10, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stan Torgovitsky
Registration No. 43,958

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 10, 2004